REMARKS

has been amended to correct a specification Specifically, the amendment replaces the clerical error. chemical structure shown for compound number 9 with the structure that corresponds to the compound 9 name shown. The inserted structure was generated using Chemdraw Ultra The inserted structure also corresponds to the v. 9.0. [M+H]+ value provided for compound deleted 9. The structure is the same as that of compound 22 on page 183 and corresponds to the [M+H]+ value for that compound.

Claims 17-20 have been cancelled as a result of the restriction requirement. Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended to read on the elected group. The claim amendments and cancellations are made without prejudice to the filing of continuation and/or divisional applications. Claims 12been withdrawn. Pursuant to MPEP 821.04, 16 have reserve the right to rejoin claims 12-16 Applicants the product claims are (process claims) once With the foregoing amendments, claims 1-11 and allowable. 21-22 are pending, and claims 12-16 are withdrawn. No new matter is added by way of the amendments.

In the restriction requirement of February 14, 2005, differentiates between non-heterocyclic the office compounds (group I) and heterocyclic compounds (group II). Based on a telephone discussion between Examiner Kumar and representative Bradley Crawford, Applicants Applicants' believe that the Office is using the term "heterocyclic" to encompass both saturated and unsaturated ring (including heteroaryl groups). Thus, Applicants believe that the present claim amendments are fully consistent with the restriction requirement.

The Applicants respectfully draw the Examiner's attention to the following of Applicants' U.S. patent applications and patent:

Serial No.	U.S. Pre-Grant Publication or Patent Number
09/895,871	2003-0096864-A1
09/895,843	6,846,813
09/896,874	2002-0016320-A1
09/896,139	2002-0128255-A1

These documents may be material to the Examiner's consideration of the currently pending claims. Applicants submit that their listing of these documents is not a representation that the references have effective dates early enough to be "prior art" within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-11, 21 and 22, in part, stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting over claims 1-346 of copending Application No. 10/291,318. The Office contends that the conflicting claims are not patentably distinct. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants submit that the structures of the compounds claimed in the present application and the compounds of the '318 application are sufficiently different that they cannot reasonably be considered patentably indistinct. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicants urge the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at (312) 913-0001 if

he believes that a discussion would expedite prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

McDonnell Boehnen

Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Dated: October 24, 2005

By:

Raafat Shaltout

Reg. No. 45,092

Hulbert & Berghoff LLP 300 South Wacker Drive Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 913-0001

McDonnell Boehnen